

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Alan Dale Chronister,	)	C/A No.: 8:12-3348-JFA-JDA
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	ORDER
	)	
Director William Byars, South Carolina	)	
Department of Corrections; Laverne Cohen,	)	
Ridgeland Correctional Institution Warden;	)	
Assoc. Warden C.A. Burton; Assoc. Warden	)	
S. Singleton; Lt. W. Buoy,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	

---

The *pro se* plaintiff, Alan Dale Chronister, is an inmate with the South Carolina Department of Corrections. At the time of the events giving rise to this action, plaintiff was incarcerated at the Ridgeland Correctional Institution. He brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 raising a variety of claims that his constitutional rights were violated relating to his conditions of confinement and lack of medical care.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action<sup>1</sup> has prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation wherein she suggests that this court should grant the defendants' motion for summary judgment.<sup>2</sup> The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of

---

<sup>1</sup> The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

<sup>2</sup> An order was issued pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975) notifying plaintiff of the summary dismissal procedure and possible consequences if he failed to adequately respond to the motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff responded to the motion.

law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation and without a hearing.

The parties were advised of their right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation which was docketed on February 5, 2014. Plaintiff timely filed objections.

The plaintiff alleges various violations under the Eighth Amendment to the Constitution with regard to the conditions of his confinement and allegations of deliberate indifference to his medical needs. The Magistrate Judge agrees with the defendants that they are entitled to summary judgment.

While the plaintiff's 37-page objection memorandum is specifically enumerated, it provides no basis for this court to deviate from the Magistrate Judge's recommended disposition and is repetitive of the claims in plaintiff's complaint. As such, the objections are overruled.

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, the Report and Recommendation, and the objections thereto, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge's recommendation and incorporates the Report herein by reference. Accordingly, the defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 85) is granted. The plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 73) is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



March 25, 2014  
Columbia, South Carolina

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.  
United States District Judge